

Emergency Ride Home:

A Survey of Current Programs and Issues

Submitted By:

Ian L. Todreas, ERG
35 India Street
Boston, MA 02110
617-357-4623
ian.todreas@erg.com

December 11, 2002

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Background	1
I. Defining “Emergency Ride Home”	1
II. Implementation and Management of ERH Programs	2
III. Perceived Value of ERH Programs	5
IV. Issues for New ERH Programs to Consider	6
V. ERH: Still Not Universally Accepted	7
VI. Conclusion	8
Appendixes	
Appendix A - Scope of ERH Program Research	9
Appendix B - Common ERH Program Designs	11
Appendix C - Costs and Usage Data By Type of Service Area	12
Appendix D - ERH Programs and Transit Case Studies	13
Appendix E - Sources	15
Tables	
Table 1: Variations in ERH Program Features	2
Table 2: Staff Time and Costs of ERH Programs by Area of Service	3

BACKGROUND

As part of its effort to promote the Best Workplaces for Commuters to interested third parties and potential employers, US EPA conducted research on emergency ride home (ERH) programs in large urban areas and in suburban/rural settings across the country. The overall goals of the research were to identify and describe:

- Successful models of ERH, their key elements, and their impact on non SOV-commuting;
- Barriers to implementing ERH programs; and
- Data on implementation costs, frequency of use, staff time typically devoted to operating an ERH program, etc.

This document presents an overview of research results from 50 in-depth interviews. Forty-six interviews were conducted with managers of ERH programs and four were conducted with managers of organizations that have elected not to offer ERH. A complete list of organizations contacted over the course of conducting this research can be found in Appendix A.

I. DEFINING “EMERGENCY RIDE HOME”

ERH programs are commonly described as an inexpensive form of commuter insurance, reassuring transit users, ridersharers, walkers, bikers, and vanpoolers that they have a timely and inexpensive way to leave work in the event of a personal or family emergency, illness, or unexpected job-related delay.

There is no one definition of what an emergency ride home is. Yet, the following features are common across many ERH programs:

- Participants register with a program before requesting an ERH.¹
- Participants contact an on-site ETC or the vendor directly to arrange an ERH.
- Participants are limited in the number of times they can access an ERH. The limits range from 2 to 24 rides per year.
- ERH is made available for personal or family illness or emergency, carpool or vanpool driver having to leave early or stay late unexpectedly, and unscheduled overtime.
- ERH is not approved for pre-planned events (e.g., doctor’s appointments, personal errands, etc.), rides to work, transit shutdowns or delays, on the job injury, or severe weather.
- Vendor is paid with a voucher.² Vouchers are then audited by ERH program managers to verify the ride was taken in accordance with ERH guidelines.
- Taxis are generally used for rides less than 20 to 25 miles or when the commuter is ill, does not have a license, or does not meet other requirements of using a rental car.

¹ 57% of the programs require pre-registration.

² 83% of the programs used vouchers.

However, while many ERH programs share common elements, programs vary according to standards for establishing participant eligibility, costs borne to commuters, and acceptable and timely ways for a commuter to get home or to another location in the event of a personal emergency or illness. Table 1 (below) shows how ERH programs generally fall into one of two categories of eligibility, ride type, and cost to commuter.

For example, the Atlanta Regional Commission offers an ERH program for any non-SOV commuter employed by a member company. The commuter pays nothing for the ride provided by taxicab or rental car and a voucher is used to pay for the ride. In rural New Hampshire and Vermont, the Upper Valley Rideshare Organization offers ERH only to registered rideshare participants. When they need a ride, commuters use any convenient mode, such as transit, fleet vehicles, or taxi services. The commuter is then reimbursed for the ride, but must pay for any part of the fare that exceeds \$50.

ERH and Unscheduled Overtime

Not every program considers unscheduled overtime a valid reason for a guarantee ride home. A California rideshare organization stopped allowing rides for unscheduled overtime given the high frequency of such overtime for workers of local tech firms. A California TMA provides rides home for unscheduled overtime, but closely monitors such use. A company's in-house ERH program stopped paying for unscheduled overtime trips, believing that individual departments should pay for those rides since it was a departmental decision to ask an employee to work late unexpectedly.

TABLE 1: VARIATIONS IN ERH PROGRAM FEATURES

ERH Program Features	Different Definitions	
Eligibility	Only certain rideshare participants or transit pass holders	Any non-SOV commuter who works within a specific geographic territory
Ride Type	Taxicab or rental car provides ride	Fleet vehicles, transit, other carpool drivers, etc. provide ride
Cost to Commuter	Free (commuter pays nothing)	Commuter pays a co-pay, tip, refueling, or insurance cost for the rental car or a percentage of the total cost (10-25%)

Appendix B describes the five most common ERH program designs.

II. IMPLEMENTATION AND MANAGEMENT OF ERH PROGRAMS

In the past 15 years, ERH programs have evolved into a common feature of TDM programs. A telephone survey of ERH programs in the late 1980s found only 11 ERH programs managed by private companies, TMAs, MPOs, or rideshare organizations operating in the United States. (Polena et al.) These ERH programs were mostly informal services relying on fleet vehicles or other employees for rides with few restrictions on their use. Today, at least 60 ERH programs operate under established, restrictive policies and procedures in numerous parts of the country.

A. How ERH Programs Were Developed

ERH programs first developed in response to a variety of concerns: federal air quality regulations, state mandates for employee trip reduction, efforts to increase participation in local ridesharing, and decisions by local officials that providing an ERH “was the right thing to do” in support of commuters using alternative modes.

Start-up funding and expenses varied across the programs. Out of the 17 contacts who could recall the source of their ERH program’s initial funding, 8 cited funding from Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) funds, 6 cited funding from state department of transportation monies, and 4 cited funds from their organizations annual operating budgets. Several programs spent no money to set up contracts with vendors to offer ERH, while others elected to supplement start-up costs with tens of thousands of dollars to market the new service.

Costs of Starting an ERH Program Vary

Entities can spend as little or as much funds as they like in starting an ERH program. Wyeth Pharmaceuticals spent “virtually nothing” in setting up service contracts with a rental car agency and taxicab company to provide ERH. Several agencies market their large, regional ERH programs along with other services with marketing budgets ranging from \$30,000 to \$50,000.

B. Cost and Usage

ERH programs generally require minimal funding and staff time to operate.³ (See Appendix C for the summary statistics on staff time, usage rates, and cost per eligible commuter.) In analyzing program costs and usage, we divided data on 46 programs into three categories:

- 1) Programs serving urban areas;
- 2) Programs serving a mixture of urban and suburban areas; and
- 3) Programs serving a mixture of suburban and rural regions.

Programs were often described by their managers as “virtually running themselves” or “requiring almost no time once it was set-up.” Programs in urban/suburban areas and those with a suburban/rural focus spent only 15 minutes per week per 100 eligible commuters to manage the program. Urban programs spent less time than their more geographically dispersed ERH peers, spending only 10 minutes per week per 100 participants.

³ The exception is the Metropolitan Washington Council of Government’s (MWCOC) program, which provides over 3,000 rides annually.

TABLE 2: STAFF TIME AND COSTS OF ERH PROGRAMS BY AREA OF SERVICE

	Urban ERH	Urban/Suburban ERH	Suburban/Rural ERH
Admin Burden (minutes/week per 100 commuters)	10	15	15
Usage Rates (rides/year per 100 commuters)	3	6	6
Cost (\$/commuter per year)	\$1.52	\$4.50	\$4.85

Only a small fraction of eligible commuters use ERH programs each year. The lowest usage was for urban-based programs that averaged only 3 rides annually for every 100 eligible commuters. Programs spanning both urban and suburban areas provide 6 rides per year per 100 eligible commuters, as do suburban/rural ERH programs.

Given their low usage and the minimal staff time required, ERH programs are a low-cost commuter benefit (see Table 2, above). For the 21 programs with available data, ERH programs consisted of an average of 3 percent of their annual commuter assistance budget. Urban ERH programs only spent \$1.52 per eligible commuter annually. The cost was higher in programs with suburban service areas. Urban/suburban programs averaged \$4.50 per eligible commuter each year, while suburban/rural services spent \$4.85.

C. Minimal Misuse and Abuse of ERH Programs

ERH misuse most often stems from miscommunication of the program's intentions. Program administrators routinely deny requests for rides from commuters not registered for the program or from those who do not have a valid reason to request an emergency ride. Programs managed by on-site ETCs or security officials have occasional misuse resulting from the on-site manager not fully understanding how an emergency ride should be approved and under what circumstances.

The most commonly reported type of misuse was commuters keeping rental cars past the allotted time. Most programs contract for 24-hour rentals, but occasionally commuters who use rental cars on Fridays do not return the cars until Monday. Some programs do not allow rental cars to be used on Fridays or require the commuter to sign an agreement with the rental agency that states that he or she must pay for additional time over the 24 hours. Other programs remain flexible given the distances some commuters live from work and the possibility that their emergency or illness situations could continue for several days.

Outright abuse of ERH is minimal to non-existent. The Southwest Ohio Regional Transit Authority was concerned about possible abuse when it implemented its ERH program for Cincinnati area commuters, but has "been pleasantly surprised by the customers and their use of the program." A quarter of the programs only described a single case of abuse over numerous years of operation. Another third could not recall any abuse. The built-in safeguards of ERH programs – requiring a commuter to pre-register, requiring a supervisor to approve the use of the ERH, etc. – effectively minimize misuse of the system.

D. ERH and Transit

Transit can be an integral part of a flexible, low-cost ERH program. ERH programs in areas with extensive transit systems often incorporate transit into their program design. Metropolitan Washington Council of Government's program in Washington, D.C., for example, uses transit as one mode to get a commuter home quickly with minimal cost. When a commuter calls to request a ride, he may be instructed to take METRO to a distant station where a taxi will be waiting to complete the ride. Programs in Boston, New York City, Minneapolis/St. Paul, and Wilmington only approve an emergency ride for a transit rider when there is not transit service within 30 to 60 minutes. (See the case studies in Appendix D for more information on how these programs use transit in their ERH programs.)

Transit offers the potential to reduce the cost of an emergency ride to the provider, but it may not serve every commuter's needs when an emergency or illness occurs. Commuters who rideshare long distances or use periodic transit, such as express buses and commuter rail, require ERH programs that supplement transit with more flexible and responsive services, such as taxicabs or rental cars.

III. PERCEIVED VALUE OF ERH PROGRAMS

Time after time, ERH program managers described ERH as "classic insurance," giving commuters the peace of mind that they will not be stranded at work in unexpected situations. According to rider feedback and testimonials, users of ERH services are generally very satisfied with ERH programs. There is less evidence of how ERH programs reduce SOV travel, but surveys by individual programs suggest that 12 to 25 percent of alternative commuters would drive alone to work if they did not have access to an emergency ride home.

A. Commuter Feedback

Commuters and their employers clearly appreciate ERH programs. Several TMAs described their ERH programs as the most prominent membership benefit they offer to member companies. Feedback on post-ride surveys and confirmation reports overwhelmingly reflect positive experiences with ERH. Commuters describe different programs as "wonderful" and "a life-saver." Even commuters who do not use the programs feel better knowing that such a program exists. For example, in a recent survey of its rideshare participants, Hunterdon Area Rural Transit TMA's commuters in northern New Jersey cited the TMA's ERH program as the number one reason they carpooled or vanpooled, even though ERH usage rates average less than 3 ERH rides a year for every 100 registered rideshare participants.

B. Impact on Single-Occupancy-Vehicle Commuting

Most programs have not systematically assessed how offering ERH decreases SOV travel. Almost all had anecdotal evidence from post-ride surveys and unsolicited commuter response. Only a few have surveyed commuters about how ERH impacts their commuting behavior. These survey results show that offering ERH consistently promotes non-SOV commuting.

- In a 1999 survey of Metro-North Railroad's ERH-eligible commuters, 16 percent said they would stop taking the connecting bus service without ERH.
- 12 percent of commuters in Sacramento TMA's ERH program said that they would stop using transit without an emergency ride.
- 26 percent of the University of Washington's monthly transit pass holders said the school's Reimbursed Ride Home program was important to their commuting decision.
- 13 percent of Kaiser Permanente's San Francisco commuters stated in a 2002 survey that the company's ERH program was influential in their choice of alternative commute modes.

IV. ISSUES FOR NEW ERH PROGRAMS TO CONSIDER

Organizations considering launching an ERH program will have to tailor the program to their local conditions, the needs of their commuters, and their ability to support ERH financially and administratively. Additionally, existing programs cite the need for secure vouchering, training on-site managers, and cooperative relationships with vendors as important factors for any successful ERH program.

A. Secure and Time-Efficient Vouchering

Over 80 percent of the programs surveyed use vouchers as payment and a way to track ERH usage. Managing the integrity and security of vouchers is an important consideration for any developing ERH program. Multi-copy vouchers allow an ERH manager to audit the rides when bills come from vendors. Managing vouchers can constitute a large portion of the

ERH Vouchers and the Internet

Missoula Ravalli TMA uses the Internet to simplify voucher delivery and security for its ERH program. Not only can commuters sign up electronically for car and vanpool services on Missoula Ravalli TMA's Web site, they can also download a personalized voucher for an emergency ride home.

administrative burden associated with an ERH program. Some ERH managers found sending out pre-printed vouchers to all participants each year too laborious, as most vouchers are never used. Other programs have voucher-on-demand systems where a commuter is faxed a voucher or can download one from the Internet when they need an emergency ride.

B. Training and Continual Outreach for On-Site Managers

Many ERH programs depend upon on-site ETCs, human resource managers, supervisors, or security personnel to approve ERH requests and manage vouchers. Thus, training for on-site managers, materials outlining the policies and procedures of the ERH program, and continual outreach is needed to reduce program misuse. Updates and retraining on the ERH program and procedures is also recommended to counteract staff turnover and the inevitable and continuous changes in personnel.

C. Cooperative and Communicative Relationships with Vendors

Good, cooperative relationships with vendors decrease ERH misuse as vendors spontaneously develop additional safeguards to make sure they are not providing rides that they will not get reimbursed for. The rental car agency for a New England TMA's ERH program proactively checks a commuter's name against the list of registered, ERH-eligible commuters when it receives a request for an emergency ride. A New York taxicab company has its drivers radio in the commuter's name and destination for approval before each ERH.

Some programs have had difficulty in finding vendors for all sites within their jurisdictions. Others have found the need to stress to their vendors to err on the side of customer service and courtesy when providing ERH or handling questions about whether a ride is within the program's guidelines.

V. ERH: STILL NOT UNIVERSALLY ACCEPTED

ERH is a low-cost commuter benefit. Commuters appreciate it, and it generally encourages them to utilize other transportation services offered by an agency or employer. However, despite its attractive elements, ERH is still not universally accepted. Some TMAs, local governments, and other agencies still decide against implementing an ERH program. The existence of a heavily used transit service, general questions about how to set up an ERH, and political apathy towards ERH all impede the adoption of ERH services.

A. Transit, Transit Everywhere

In areas with high transit use, employers and agencies sometimes do not see the need for ERH. As a service to give transit riders flexible, responsive, and speedy rides home in case of emergency, there is conventional wisdom that the transit service either cannot be beat by ERH taxi or rental car services or it is not enough of an incentive to convince drivers to leave their cars at home. For example, as an organization supportive of alternative commuting modes, the San Francisco TMA considered implementing an ERH but found that there is not significant demand among commuters for the service as transit service is readily available. In addition, only 6 percent of workers in the TMA's service area drive to work alone, a number so low that implementing an ERH service would not yield a mode shift among drive-alone commuters to warrant the effort.

B. Political Apathy Towards ERH

ERH programs compete with other commuting services for scarce funding and staff time to oversee the program. When the perception that instituting an ERH will be costly and frequently abused, its relative advantages are screened and decisions are tipped in favor of other services. A lack of interest in ERH by regional decision-makers and funding sources was cited as a reason why some areas did not support ERH.

C. Need for General Information on ERH

Agencies or companies developing an ERH program often have numerous questions about how to set up and manage a program. Many respondents described significant research efforts they undertook to learn more about how other ERH programs operate. Currently, this research happens on an informal, individual basis with each new agency having to ask and answer many of the same questions agencies and organizations have asked before in starting their ERH program.

VI. CONCLUSION

Today's commuters want and appreciate a quick, inexpensive ride home from work in times of emergency or illness. Such a service will help encourage commuters to try transit, ridesharing, and other non-SOV modes of transportation and maintain their commitment to these modes. Best Workplaces for Commuters can play a valuable role in helping agencies and employers establish ERH programs by:

- Articulating the value of ERH as a proven, effective, and inexpensive way to promote alternative commuting.
- Sharing sample policies and procedures for new ERH programs to follow.
- Defining ERH broadly as a requirement for qualifying for the *National Standard of Excellence* and rewarding those who have it with recognition.

With increasingly longer commutes and growing dispersion of workers, ERH programs' importance in supporting alternative commuting choices will only continue to grow.

APPENDIX A

SCOPE OF ERH PROGRAM RESEARCH

Breakdown by Type of Organizations Interviewed:

MPO/Local Govt	9
TMA	15
Transit Agency	10
Private Company	6
Rideshare/TDM	4
University	2

Total: 46

States Represented:

Arizona (1), California (10), Delaware (1), Washington, D.C. (1), Florida (2), Georgia (1), Massachusetts (1), Michigan (2), Minnesota (1), Missouri (3), Montana (1), New Jersey (5), New York (3), North Carolina (1), Ohio (2), Oklahoma (1), Pennsylvania (4), Tennessee (1), Vermont/New Hampshire (1), Washington (4)

Organizations:

Ace Rail, California	Metro, Minneapolis/St Paul, Minnesota
Atlanta Regional Commission	Metro-North Railroad, New York
Avista Corporation, Washington	Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments (MWCOG)
Artery Business Council TMA, Boston	Miami Valley Regional Planning Commission, Dayton
Bay Area Commuter Services, Tampa	Mid-America Regional Council
Bucks County TMA, Pennsylvania	Missoula/Ravalli TMA, Montana
Citizens for Modern Transit, St. Louis	Nashville Regional Transportation Authority, Tennessee
CommuterLink, New York City	Peninsula Traffic Congestion Relief Authority, San Mateo, California
Downtown Transportation Initiative, Miami	Pfizer, Morris Plains, New Jersey
Fluke Corporation, Washington	Pittsburgh Airport Corridor TMA, Pennsylvania
Glendale TMA/City of Glendale, California	Sacramento TMA, California
Greater Mercer TMA, New Jersey	San Diego County Transit System, California
Hunterdon Area Rural Transit, New Jersey	SE Michigan Council of Governments
Interurban Transportation Partnership, Michigan	South Natomas TMA, California
Kaiser Permanente, Southern California	SW Ohio Regional Transit Authority
Kaiser Permanente, Oakland, California	TMA Delaware
Kansas City Area Transportation Authority, Missouri	Triangle Transit Authority, North Carolina
Keep Middlesex Moving, New Jersey	Tulsa Oklahoma Rideshare
Long Island Transportation Management, New York	
MeadowLinks TMA, New Jersey	
Metro, King County, Washington	

University of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
University of Washington
Upper Valley Rideshare, New
Hampshire/Vermont

Valley Metro Regional Public
Transportation Agency, Phoenix, Arizona
Ventura County, California
Warner Center TMO, California
Wyeth Pharmaceuticals, Pennsylvania

Contacts Without ERH

MPO	2
TMA	1
Transit Agency	1

Total: 4

States Represented:

California (2), Illinois (1), Pennsylvania (1)

Organizations:

Chicago Area Transportation Study (CATS)
Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission (DVRPC)
Orange County Transit Authority, California
San Francisco TMA

APPENDIX B: COMMON ERH PROGRAM DESIGNS

Regional ERH. Any non-SOV commuter in a defined area is eligible for an ERH. The programs are usually managed by region-wide entities such as a MPO, local government, or regional rideshare organization. The commuter registers with the program and receives vouchers to use for an ERH. When commuters need an ERH, they call one of the authorized vendors or contacts the ERH program managers for the ride.

Examples: Bay Area Commuter Services (Tampa, FL), Downtown Transportation Management Initiative (Miami, FL), HART TMA, Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments, Minneapolis-St. Paul's Metro Commuter Services, Missoula Ravalli TMA, Peninsula Traffic Congestion Relief Authority (San Mateo, CA), TMA Delaware, Ventura County (CA)

Transit Pass Benefit ERH. An ERH is a benefit for certain transit pass holders and is managed directly by the transit agency or an intermediate agency, which coordinates pass purchases by many commuters. Commuters contact the transit agency when in need of an ERH.

Examples: ACE Rail, Interurban Transportation Partnership (Grand Rapids, MI), Kansas City Area Transportation Authority, Metro-North Railroad, SW Ohio Regional Transit Authority, Nashville Regional Transportation Authority, Triangle Transit Authority, University of Washington

Rideshare Benefit ERH. An ERH is a benefit only for participants in a rideshare program. The rideshare participants contact the coordinating agency, such as a TMA or a rideshare organization, when in need of an ERH.

Examples: CommuterLink (NYC), Miami Valley Regional Planning Commission (Dayton, OH), SE Michigan Council of Governments (Detroit), University of Pittsburgh, Upper Valley Rideshare (NH/VT)

Employer Membership ERH. Any commuter working for a firm that is affiliated with an ERH-providing organization is eligible to take an ERH. The commuter contacts the ERH-providing organization or, more often, an on-site ETC when in need of an ERH. The ERH-providing organization, usually a TMA or a local government, provides the ETC with vouchers and guidelines on how to administer the program.

Examples: ABC TMA, Atlanta Regional Commission, Bucks County TMA, Citizens for Modern Transit (St. Louis), Glendale TMA, Long Island Transportation Management Inc, METRO (Seattle), Mid-America Regional Council (Kansas City), Pittsburgh Airport Corridor TMA, Sacramento TMA, South Natomas TMA, Tulsa Area Rideshare, Warner Center TMO

Internal ERH. A private company manages an ERH for its own employees with an ETC administering the program. The company contracts directly with taxicab or rental car vendors or allows employees to use fleet vehicles when in need of an ERH.

Examples: Avista, Fluke, Kaiser Permanente, Pfizer, Wyeth Pharmaceuticals

APPENDIX C
COSTS AND USAGE DATA BY TYPE OF SERVICE AREA

	URBAN	RBAN/SUBURBAN	UBURBAN/RURAL
	Minutes Wk/100 Commuters	Minutes Wk/100 Commuters	Minutes Wk/100 Commuters
Mean	10.4 minutes	15.3 minutes	15.1 minutes
Median	10.5 minutes	5.6 minutes S	7.6 minutes
Range	0.7 – 20 minutes	0 – 67 minutes	0 -- 60 minutes
Count	4	16	18
	# Rides Yr/100 Commuters	# Rides Yr/100 Commuters	# Rides Yr/100 Commuters
Mean	3.19 U	5.6	6.23
Median	1	3.74	2.05
Range	0.30 – 7.51	0 – 37.64	0 -- 54.67
Count	5	18	16
		Cost/Commuter	Cost/Commuter
Mean	\$1.52	\$4.50	\$4.85
Median	\$1.00	\$1.56	\$2.05
Range	\$0.12 - \$3.33	\$0.15 - \$35.71	\$0 - \$36.02
Count	5	16	16

Cost/Commuter

APPENDIX D

ERH PROGRAMS AND TRANSIT CASE STUDIES

ARTERY BUSINESS COUNCIL TMA, BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS

ABC TMA serves firms located in downtown Boston. Numerous bus, subway, and rail transit options are available to commuters working in this area. Registered commuters who normally take transit are not eligible for an ERH unless there is not transit service available within the next hour or if they are too ill or otherwise unable to take transit.

KAISER PERMANENTE, SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

Kaiser Permanente administers an ERH program for its numerous facilities in and around Los Angeles. Kaiser's LA Hospital is located next to a stop on LA's Red Line subway. Even though the facility is well served by transit, the company saw value in establishing an ERH service. While transit riders at this site tend not to use the ERH service, many carpoolers and vanpoolers do (the facility has more ERH requests than any other site).

METROPOLITAN WASHINGTON COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Metropolitan Washington Council of Government's (MWCOC) ERH program will take commuters who work in Washington, D.C., home up to distances of two hours away, including areas in five states. To minimize the costs of these potentially long rides, MWCOC incorporates the area's transit system into its program. For instance, after talking with an ERH dispatcher, a commuter may be instructed to take the subway to the farthest station where a cab will be waiting to help complete the journey. The commuter is later reimbursed for the subway fare.

METRO-NORTH RAILROAD, NEW YORK CITY

MNR has an ERH program for its commuters who purchase monthly Uni-passes. With these passes, commuters take buses from their home or park-and-ride lots to Metro-North train stations and then take the trains into the city. Each month, a Uni-pass holder is entitled to two taxi rides from the suburban train stations to their destinations during the hours that the connecting bus service is not running. Commuters still must take a Metro-North train back up to the station where they hail waiting taxis. MNR does not require that the commuter have an emergency or illness situation, only that the taxi ride be taken when there is no connecting bus service.

METRO COMMUTER SERVICES, MINNEAPOLIS/SAINT PAUL

Commuters who sign up for Minneapolis/St. Paul's Metro Commuter Services ERH Program have a choice of using local bus service or a taxicab to get home. To use the bus for an ERH, a commuter simply places the ERH voucher into a bus' fare box. If a taxicab is used, the commuter must pay for the ride and request reimbursement from Metro.

TRIANGLE TRANSIT AUTHORITY, RESEARCH TRIANGLE PARK

If normal bus service is available within 30 minutes to the commuter requesting an ERH, the Triangle Part Transit ERH manager does not approve the ERH request. Dispatchers will work with commuters requesting an ERH to see if there is acceptable transit already available from the Transit Authority.

TMA DELAWARE

For its Home Free Program, TMA Delaware requires all commuters to pre-register. Registered transit users can only use an ERH if transit service is not available within the hour or if the commuter needs to make multiple stops in response to the emergency or illness.

APPENDIX E

SOURCES

Association for Commuter Transportation, Transportation Demand Management Institute. *TDM Case Studies and Commuter Testimonials* (August 1997). Accessed at <http://www.nctr.usf.edu/clearinghouse/tdmresearch.htm> on October 23, 2002.

“Bi-State Will Help Pay for Rides Home in an Emergency,” *St. Louis Post-Dispatch* (October 3, 2000), C3.

Brown, Craig. “Carpool Incentive: A Free Ride,” *The Columbian* (November 22, 1998), E1.

“Bus Riders, Carpoolers on I-94 Get Emergency Ride Home,” *PR Newswire* (September 19, 1995).

California Air Resources Board. *A Survey and Analysis of Employees Response to Employer-Sponsored Trip Reduction Programs* (February 1994).

Domrzalski, Dennis. “City Will Guarantee Rides for Stranded Commuters,” *Albuquerque Tribune* (September 17, 1996), A7.

“Guaranteed Ride Program Begins,” *The Buffalo News* (January 23, 1999), 5C.

Frederick, Stephanie and Kay Kenyon. *Difficulties with the Easy Ride Project: Obstacles to Voluntary Ridesharing in the Suburbs*. Transportation Research Record 1321 (1991), pp. 13-20.

Gutierrez, Bridget. “While the Success of a New Transit Tax Credit...” *The Daily Record* (February 1, 2000), 1A.

Hough, Robert. “Bus Riders, Carpoolers to Get a Lift From New Program Guaranteed Ride Home,” *Ventura County Star* (September 17, 1997), A01.

K.T. Analytics. “TDM Status Report; Guaranteed Ride Home,” Federal Transit Administration, USDOT (August 1992) Accessed at <http://www.fta.dot.gov/library/planning/tdmstatus/FTAGUAR2.htm>.

Ledford, Joey. “Ridesharers Have Way Home in Emergency,” *The Atlanta Journal and Constitution* (July 4, 1999), 2C.

Lipton, Eric. “New Mass Transit Program Touts Free Emergency Rides,” *The Washington Post* (January 15, 1997), V04.

Lipton, Eric. “Program Offers Commuters an Emergency Ride,” *The Washington Post* (June 19, 1997), J01.

McClannahan, Rory. "SunTran Guarantees Riders a Way Home," *Albuquerque Journal* (March 11, 1997), C1.

Metcalf, Coll. "Guaranteed Ride Service Helping, Officials Report," *Los Angeles Times* (March 5, 1999), B1.

Moody, Sandi. "Commuter Choices More Critical Than Ever," *The Tampa Tribune* (October 5, 2002), p. 19.

National Center for Transit Research's National Transportation Demand Management and Telework Clearinghouse. *Fundamentals about a Emergency Ride Home Program*. Accessed at <http://www.nctr.usf.edu/clearinghouse/ERHfund.htm> on October 23, 2002.

Park, Christopher. *Evaluation of Second-Year Effectiveness of GRH Service at Warner Center Transportation Management Organization*, Transportation Research Record 1338 (1992), pp. 90-93.

Polena, Cosett and Lawrence Jesse Glazer. *Examination of 11 GRH Programs Nationwide*, Transportation Research Record 1321 (1991) pp. 57-65.

"Ranks of Commuter Moms Growing, Companies Respond by Offering Alternative Work Schedules, 'Emergency Ride Home' Programs," *Business Wire* (June 9, 1993).

Reed, Mack. "Ride-Home Guarantee Proposed to Drive up CAR-Pooling," *Los Angeles Times* (July 11, 1997), B1.

"Share Costs, Save Gas, Save Cash! SEMCOG's RideShare Program Offers Commuters Relief From Soaring Pump Prices," *PR Newswire* (June 9, 2000).

Sullivan, Deborah. "County Car Poolers Can Get Ride Home," *The Daily News of Los Angeles* (September 30, 1997).

US Department of Transportation. *Guaranteed Ride Home: Taking the Worry Out of Ridesharing* (November 1990) <http://ntl.bts.gov/data/T-91-09.pdf>.